

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

COPY MAILED

HELLER EHRMAN LLP 1717 RHODE ISLAND AVE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3001

MAR 0 4 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Ian Hector Frazer

Application No. 10/534,130 Filed: December 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 21415-0015

ON PETITION

This is a decision in response to the petition, filed November 21, 2007, to revive the above-identified application under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b).

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Paul M. Booth appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to petitioner. However, if Mr. Booth desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. All future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the address of record.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed April 4, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of one (1) month or thirty (30) days (whichever is later). No extension of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) was obtained. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on October 18, 2007. In response, on November 21, 2007 the present petition was filed.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the response in the form of an election of the invention to be examined; (2) the petition fee of \$1,540; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay¹.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Since the \$2,230 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on November 21, 2007

¹ 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. While it is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account.

The application is being referred to Technology Center AU 1636 for consideration of the response filed November 21, 2007.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. All other inquiries regarding this application should be directed to the Technology Center.

Sherry D. Brinkley Petitions Examiner Office of Petitions

cc: PAUL M. BOOTH

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP 1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, N.W., SUITE 400 SOUTH

WASHINGTON, DC 20004